



# County of Los Angeles CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration  
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012  
(213) 974-1101  
<http://ceo.lacounty.gov>

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA  
Chief Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors  
GLORIA MOLINA  
First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS  
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY  
Third District

DON KNABE  
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH  
Fifth District

June 26, 2012

To: Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky, Chairman  
Supervisor Gloria Molina  
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas  
Supervisor Don Knabe  
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: William T Fujioka  
Chief Executive Officer

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "W. T. Fujioka", is written over the printed name and title.

## ASSESSMENT/PROJECTION OF REDEVELOPMENT DISSOLUTION EFFORT

Over the past several months, the County has undertaken a complex and massive work effort to comply with the enactment of ABx1 26 (Redevelopment Dissolution Act), in order to ensure legal compliance with the dictates of the Act and to protect the County's significant financial interests in this process. This has involved overseeing audits of all 71 of the County's former redevelopment agencies, appointing County members to the oversight boards over each of the former agencies, providing training and guidance on implementation of the Act, analyzing and proposing County positions on related legislation, and supporting the meetings and activities of the oversight boards.

With the conclusion of the first two sets of Recognized Obligation Payment Schedules (ROPS) prepared by each of the former agencies to identify ongoing obligations, we are submitting the following to the Board as an assessment of the County's effort to date and identification of considerations for enhancing the effort going forward:

- Summary report (Attachment I), based on a debriefing meeting of staff from Auditor-Controller, County Counsel, Executive Office of the Board, consultants and this Office; and
- Reports prepared by the two consulting firms assisting County staff with the Dissolution process:
  - "Draft Debriefing on ROPS I and II and Roadmap toward ROPS III," by Estolano LeSar Perez (Attachment II); and
  - "Observations on Past and Future Processes," by Seifel Consulting, Inc. (Attachment III).

*"To Enrich Lives Through Effective And Caring Service"*

***Please Conserve Paper – This Document and Copies are Two-Sided  
Intra-County Correspondence Sent Electronically Only***

Each Supervisor  
June 26, 2012  
Page 2

We would like to thank all the County staff who have so diligently endeavored to manage and coordinate this unprecedented project and the Board offices for providing guidance and support. We look forward to working closely with the Board and others as the important process continues.

Please let me know if you have any questions, or your staff may contact Martin Zimmerman at 213.974.1326, or [mzimmerman@ceo.lacounty.gov](mailto:mzimmerman@ceo.lacounty.gov).

WTF:ES  
MKZ:ib

Attachments (3)

c:     Executive Office, Board of Supervisors  
         County Counsel  
         Auditor-Controller  
         Regional Planning  
         Treasurer and Tax Collector  
         Community Development Commission/Housing Authority

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES REDEVELOPMENT DISSOLUTION EFFORT**  
**Assessment of Initial Activities – Summary Report**

• **TEAM COORDINATION AND COMMUNICATION**

○ **What worked well:**

- Communication between Board offices, central staff departments, and consultants became increasingly effective and expedited despite time constraints.
- Daily postings of routine shared documents on Central RDA Document Library worked well.

○ **Going forward:**

- Further streamline coordination and communication through increased use of Central Library.
- Continue timely coordination and communication of agendas, background materials and meeting highlights to central staff departments and consultants.

• **STAFFING**

○ **What worked well:**

- Staffing was tight, but major objectives met.

○ **Going forward:**

- CEO is requesting additional staffing to track real property assets and reduce dependence on consultants; Auditor-Controller will review need for additional staff; County Counsel looking at additional outside counsel.

• **ROPS REVIEW**

○ **What worked well:**

- Via generalized training and focused analysis and guidance on high priority cities, the County was able to impart key information regarding expenditures eligible for listing on ROPS.

○ **Going forward:**

- Obtain final approved ROPS II for comparison to ROPS III.
- Establish timeline for ROPS III preparation, review and oversight board approval (no later than 30-45 days in advance of the deadline date for submitting ROPS III to the Auditor-Controller and State DOF).
- Share information from AUPs.
- Issue general guidelines to oversight boards and successor agencies to ensure ROPS III is prepared using the DOF template; provide tips on how to avoid common actions/mistakes resulting in DOF rejections of items; and expedite ROPS approval.

• **CONSULTANT ASSISTANCE**

○ **What worked well:**

- ELP and Seifel provided quick, thorough and expert guidance and assistance to the County team and oversight boards.

- **Going forward:**
  - Additional consultant assistance in such specialized areas as asset disposition, contract renegotiation and bond refinancing will be necessary.
  - Determine highest priority tasks that should be focus of consultant efforts.
- **OVERSIGHT BOARD SUPPORT**
  - **What worked well:**
    - Identifying high priority oversight boards (based on fiscal impact) for which full analysis would be provided made maximum use of limited resources in tight time frame.
  - **Going forward:**
    - Reassessment of criteria for and prioritization of designated high priority oversight boards will be necessary; e.g., cities with high value real property assets.
    - Ensure close liaison between central staff, consultants and Board offices on oversight board member support and correspondence.
- **LIAISON WITH STATE AGENCIES**
  - **What worked well:**
    - In spite of the time constraints due to shorten deadline dates, the Auditor-Controller maintained communication with DOF to resolve immediate ROPS issues in order to make the June 1 payment distribution date.
  - **Going forward:**
    - Effect better coordination with State Controller and Department of Finance (e.g., sharing copies of correspondence with successor agencies/oversight boards, including, ROPS acknowledgement letters).
    - Request DOF to attach ROPS to their approval/acknowledgement letters.
    - Encourage CSAC to provide more leadership in advocating for counties with the Administration and Legislature.
- **TRAINING**
  - **What worked well:**
    - Webinar training proved more convenient, accessible and popular than in-person training.
    - Town Hall meeting conducted by Auditor-Controller, with participation of State Controller's Office and DOF, provided timely and pertinent information to successor agencies.
  - **Going forward:**
    - Training will need to focus on upcoming oversight board business including property and other asset disposition, contract renegotiation, cash balance/cash flow review, bond refinancing and defeasance, and ROPS III review. Emphasize oversight boards' fiduciary responsibility towards the holders of enforceable obligations as well as taxing entities.
    - Update training manual to reflect guidance on above-mentioned topics and enacted legislation modifying ABx1 26 (Dissolution Act).
    - Schedule and provide webinar training to oversight board members and/or successor agencies in advance of ROPS III review.
    - If necessary and appropriate, schedule Town Hall meeting with successor agencies to provide updated information in advance of ROPS III review.

- **LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY**

- **What worked well:**

- Effective advocacy with the Administration and the Legislature - the County actively advocated on significant redevelopment legislation and was able to help stall key measures that would have resulted in significant revenue losses to the County and affected taxing entities [i.e. AB 1585 (Perez), SB 659 (Padilla), SB 986 (Dutton), etc.]. The County also communicated strategic information regarding pass-through agreement calculations and engaged key Administration officials with favorable interpretation of these calculations, which was later supported by the State Controller's Office and CSAC.
    - Maintained the Board and affected departments apprised of significant developments - provided continuous timely updates on advocacy efforts on "clean up" legislation, State negotiations, trailer bills, and other proposals that could affect County revenues or operations.
    - Conducted regular and emergency meetings with various Board deputies to communicate major developments in Sacramento, strategize and obtain expedited input from Board offices in order to advocate for the County's interests.
    - Responsiveness – CEO-IGEA maintained the Board informed of key legislation and/or budget actions in Sacramento on a timely basis and was able to draft pursuits of advocacy positions to ensure the County was at forefront of RDA advocacy efforts.

- **Going forward:**

- Continue timely communication and coordination with affected stakeholders and statewide associations (i.e. CSAC, Auditors and County Counsels associations) to identify priority issues and advocate and/or advance proposals of importance to the County.
    - Continue to provide key information and work with the redevelopment workgroup and affected departments to enhance the timely review of legislative proposals to determine potential impact, including amendments to modify legislation to better support County needs.
    - Continue to facilitate reporting to the Board and larger workgroups on the impact of proposed legislation and State Budget proposals.

# Estolano LeSar Perez

DATE: May 23, 2012

TO: Brence Culp  
Martin Zimmerman  
Robert Moran  
Charlene Abe

FROM: Cecilia V. Estolano, Jennifer LeSar, and Gretchen Kinney Newsom

SUBJECT: Draft Debriefing on ROPS I and II and Roadmap toward ROPS III

---

This draft memo seeks to summarize key lessons learned during the process Oversight Boards undertook to adopt their first and second set of Recognized Obligation Payment Schedules (ROPS), and where Successor Agencies sought approval by the Department of Finance (DOF) for these ROPS.

## Timing and the Review of ROPS

Ideally, the review and approval process of ROPS III and IV should be initiated no later than 30-45 days in advance of the deadline for submitting approved ROPS to the CAC and DOF.

There were countless occurrences of Oversight Board members requesting supplemental background and documentation on various ROPS line items and tabling line items and ROPS until later meetings, and there were also many occurrences of the Department of Finance rejecting approval of submitted ROPS resulting in additional meetings of the Oversight Boards to revise and approve amended ROPS.

We have outlined a draft timeline anticipating the ideal review and approval of ROPS III – please see the attached timeline document.

## Synchronizing ROPS to the DOF Template

Oversight Board appointees should direct Successor Agency staff members to draft ROPS in accordance with the template issued by the DOF, inclusive of further DOF revisions to the template, and to input all data requested by the DOF. This will help avoid unnecessary delays and DOF invalidations of ROPS that fail to meet their requirements.



---

Examples of instances of incomplete ROPS include the failure to include payments for the specified time period (i.e. January payments were often not included on ROPS I), and the failure to specify dollar amounts, payees, or funding sources for all line items.

#### **Addressing Ambiguities in AB1x26 and DOF Interpretation**

The Department of Finance has issued many letters invalidating City loans as enforceable obligations per their limited review and interpretation of Health and Safety Code section 34171(d)(2). In their letters, the DOF often includes the following language:

*"Agreements, contracts, or arrangements between the city that created the redevelopment agency (RDA) and the former RDA are not enforceable unless the loan agreements were entered into within the first two years of the date of the creation of the RDA."*

The above citation ignores the full passage of this section of the Health and Safety Code, which states:

*"For purposes of this part, "enforceable obligation" does not include any agreements, contracts, or arrangements between the city, county, or city and county that created the redevelopment agency and the former redevelopment agency. However, written agreements entered into (A) at the time of issuance, but in no event later than December 31, 2010, of indebtedness obligations, and (B) solely for the purpose of securing or repaying those indebtedness obligations may be deemed enforceable obligations for purposes of this part. Notwithstanding this paragraph, loan agreements entered into between the redevelopment agency and the city, county, or city and county that created it, within two years of the date of creation of the redevelopment agency, may be deemed to be enforceable obligations."*

This disparity of interpretation of HRC needs to be addressed either through direct dialogue with senior staff at DOF and/or through legislative amendments to the DOF trailer bill.

#### **Avoiding Common Actions resulting in the Rejection of ROPS or EO's**

We have carefully reviewed all letters available to our team that were authored by the DOF wherein the Department rejected ROPS or specific Enforceable Obligations. We have compiled these rejection actions in the attached addendum and we intend on drafting common language to be utilized in our forthcoming ROPS III and IV review memos to appropriately mitigate many, if not all, of these invalidations, and to better inform Oversight Board appointees on the common questions to be asked and documents or items of information to request.



---

## Addendum

### Annotated DOF Rejections of ROPS and Enforceable Obligations

The below outline and based on a review of all letters available to our team from the DOF wherein the Department rejected ROPS or specific Enforceable Obligations.

#### Invalidations of Specific Enforceable Obligations

##### I. Administrative Costs Claimed Exceeds Allowance

DOF Reasoning: "HSC section 34171 (b) limits fiscal year 2011-12 administrative expenses to five percent (for ROPS I; 3% for ROPS II) of property tax allocated to the successor agency or \$250,000, whichever is greater."

Cities: Alhambra; Avalon; Bell Gardens; Cerritos; Covina; Culver City; Hawthorne; Irwindale; Lynwood; Montebello; Norwalk; Palmdale; Pasadena; Santa Clarita; Santa Monica; South El Monte; South Gate; Torrance; Whittier;

##### II. City Loans, Agreements, or Contracts

(See 'Addressing Ambiguities in AB1x26 and DOF Interpretation' in attached memo.)

#### Varied DOF Reasoning:

1) HSC section 34171 (d) (2) states that loans between the entity that created the redevelopment agency (RDA) and the former RDA are only enforceable if made within the first two years of the RDA's existence.


2) HSC section 34171 (d) (2) states that agreements, contracts, or arrangements between the city, county, or city and county that created the redevelopment agency (RDA) and the former RDA are not EOs.

3) HSC section 34171 (d) (2) states that agreements, contracts, or arrangements between the city, county, or city and county that created the redevelopment agency and the former redevelopment agency are not enforceable obligations.  
(Montebello; Signal Hill)

Cities: Baldwin Park; Bell Gardens; Bell Flower (2); Cerritos (EOPS and ROPS); Covina (2); Hawthorne; Irwindale; Lakewood (2); Lancaster (EOPS); Long Beach (EOPS); Lynwood; Montebello (3); Pasadena (EOPS and ROPS); Pico Rivera; Santa Clarita; Signal Hill (3); South Gate; Torrance; Whittier;

##### III. Non-Existent Contract or Non-Executed Contracts

DOF Reasoning: No contract has been entered for this project. Because there was no contract in place prior to the June 28, 2011 date, this item is not an EO. Or, projects are without signed/fully executed contracts





---

Cities: Artesia; Compton (EOPS); Covina; South El Monte; South Gate; Whittier;

#### **IV. Agreements with Cities, Not RDAs**

DOF Reasoning: Items that are either agreements with the City and not the RDA, or are contracts that identify the City and a third-party and are therefore, not enforceable obligations of the Agency.

Cities: Artesia; Avalon; Covina; Irwindale; Lynwood; South Gate;

#### **V. Pass Through Payments**

DOF Reasoning: HSC section 34183 requires pass-through payments to be made by the county auditor controller prior to distribution of property tax to the successor agency. Therefore, these deferred pass-through payments (including payments to the County) should not be listed in the ROPS.

Cities: Avalon

#### **VI. Tax Increment or Property Tax Administration Fees**

Varied DOF Reasoning:

1) HSC section 34182 (e) states that county auditor-controller may charge the Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund for the cost of administering the provisions of this part. Therefore, the debt obligation is not an EO.

2) HSC section 34182 (e) allows the county auditor-controller to deduct from the Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund for their administration costs prior to distributing property tax increment funds.

Cities: Bell Gardens; Bell Flower (2); Lynwood;

#### **VII. Expenses not Paid Through Tax Increment Revenue**

DOF Reasoning: Bonds that are secured and paid by (specified alternative source) revenue and not tax increment revenue are not an EO. (Bell Gardens).


Expenses (such as pension overrides) paid directly through Los Angeles County and not from tax increment revenue are not considered an EO (Bell Gardens).

Cities: Bell Gardens

#### **VIII. Entering Into Contracts/Agreements Post June 27, 2011**

Varied DOF Reasoning:

1) HSC 34163 (b) prohibits a redevelopment agency from entering into contracts (with any entity) after June 27, 2011. Therefore, this is not an EO.



---

2) The reimbursement agreements are not EO's unless a repayment schedule existed before June 28, 2011.

Cities: Bell Gardens; Monterey Park; Cerritos (EOPS); Compton (EOPS); Lakewood; Long Beach (EOPS); Norwalk; Palmdale; Pasadena (EOPS and ROPS 1 and 2); Pomona; Rosemead; San Gabriel; Santa Clarita; Signal Hill;

**IX. Not Providing Documents to Validate Enforceable Obligations**

DOF Reasoning: The Agency did not provide documentation to support these items (examples include SERAF Loan Repayments).

Cities: Bell Gardens; Culver City; Hawthorne; La Puente; Palmdale; West Covina;

**X. Conditions of the disposition and development agreement (DDA) have not been met**

DOF Reasoning: Examples include: the developer's equity account has not been established, the ground lease agreement has not been executed, and project costs are estimates without executed contracts) and there has been no activity concerning this agreement in the past four years.

Cities: Cerritos;

**XI. Housing Set Aside Deferrals**

DOF Reasoning: The requirement to set aside 20 percent of RDA tax increment for low and moderate income housing purposes ended with the passing of the redevelopment dissolution legislation. HSC section 34177 (d) requires that all unencumbered balances in the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund be remitted to the county auditor controller for distribution to the taxing entities. Therefore, this item is not an EO.

Cities: Covina; Culver City; Long Beach (EOPS); Montebello; Palmdale; Pasadena; Pomona; Signal Hill; Whittier;

**XII. Creation of Reserves**

DOF Reasoning: HSC section 34177 (b) allows reserves required for indentures, trust indentures, or similar documents governing the issuance of outstanding RDA bonds. The statute does not currently recognize contingent or unknown obligations, thus creation of reserves for such items are not permissible.

Cities: Lynwood

**XIII. ROPS Amount versus Audited Financial Statements Balance**

DOF Reasoning: The final ROPS amount of a line item doesn't match audited financial statements balance.



---

Cities: South El Monte

**Incomplete ROPS and Synchronizing ROPS to DOF Template**

**I. Line Items did not Specify Dollar Amounts, Funding Sources, or Payees**

DOF Reasoning: The HSC section 34177(l) (1) specifically states to prepare the ROPS using the requirements stated within the section (inclusive of dollar amounts); For line items funded by multiple funding sources, the ROPS submitted must include a specific amount for each funding sources and the payee.

Cities: Alhambra, Arcadia; Commerce; La Verne; Lancaster; Palmdale; Pasadena; Pico Rivera; Redondo Beach; Santa Fe Springs; Santa Monica

**II. Multiple Funding Sources**

DOF Reasoning: For line items funded by multiple funding sources, the ROPS submitted must include a specific amount for each funding sources.

Cities: Arcadia; Commerce; Lynwood; Paramount; Redondo Beach

**III. Missing January payments or Listing Incorrect Period of Time**

DOF Reasoning: HSC section 34177 (l) (3) states the first ROPS shall be for the period of January 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012, inclusive.

Cities: Arcadia; La Verne; Lancaster; Palmdale; Pasadena; Pico Rivera; Santa Fe Springs; Santa Monica;

**IV. Line Items in the Amount of \$0 (Zero)**

DOF Reasoning: Items that are place holders for potential expenditures should not be included as an item on the ROPS unless a transaction has occurred.

Cities: Cerritos (EOPS);



# DRAFT Revised ROPS Review Timeline

Current Language	Proposed Language	Proposed Timeline		Notes
<p>Section 34199(h) -- DOF has three days to request a review of oversight board actions and ten days from the date of the request to approve the oversight board action or send it back</p> <p>Section 34183(a) -- On January 16th and June 1st of each year, allocate moneys from the RPTTF to successor agencies for payments listed on the ROPS</p>	<p>Section 34177(p) -- Starting with the ROPS covering January 1, 2013 through June 30, 2013, successor agencies shall submit oversight board-approved ROPS to DOF and auditor-controller 45 days before the date upon which the ROPS is to take effect</p> <p>Section 34177(p)(2) -- If the successor agency does not submit an oversight board-approved ROPS that meets DOF's standards within five business days "of the date upon which the [ROPS] is to be used to determine the amount of properly tax allocations," DOF can determine what payments are withheld</p>	Mid to Late July	Provide oversight board trainings in preparation for the review of the 3rd ROPS	<p>Oversight boards will want the successor agency to present their third ROPS in July so that they can complete the review and approval process by the September 3rd deadline.</p> <p>This date gives the auditor-controller the same amount of time to calculate and make payments to the successor agencies using the timeline in the oversight board training manual</p> <p>Need clarification on whether or not the 45 days are calendar or business days</p> <p>Who determines the date that the ROPS are used to determine properly tax allocations? Based on the previous timeline, the five-day timeframe in the revised legislation would not be enough time for the auditor-controller to make payments.</p>
		Late July	Begin review of the 3rd ROPS	
		September 3, 2012	LA County deadline for successor agencies to submit oversight board-approved 3rd ROPS to DOF and County Auditor-Controller	
		October 30, 2012 (business days)	Deadline for successor agencies to submit oversight board-approved 3rd ROPS to DOF and County Auditor-Controller	
		November 17, 2012 (calendar days)		
		January 9, 2013	DOF can make determinations about which funds can be withheld	

June 7, 2012 Redevelopment Dissolution Meeting

Observations on Past and Future Processes

PAST PROCESS/PROCEDURES REVIEW

1. Debriefing/Lessons Learned/Challenges

Training

- Many OB appointees participated in onsite and web sessions. Availability of online video was helpful.
- Training and manual frequently referred to in OB meetings.

ROPS I and II Challenges

- Lack of clarity in how to interpret ABx1 26 (DOF guidance changing)
- Changing versions of ROPS, as well as latest ROPS not being posted on website
- ROPS formats varied from SA to SA
- DOF format made available late in process after Initial ROPS was prepared (March)
- Funding sources not listed and not allocated among sources (in some cases other revenue sources were not cited—ex, parking revenues could be used to help pay for a parking garage, however, it was hard to tell if such revenues were available)
- Lack of consistent numbering among different versions of ROPS and from ROPS I to ROPS II
- Only having PDF versions of ROPS (v. excel)

Staff Support/Consultant Services and Oversight Board Support

- Short time period between meeting notice and meeting date (Special Meeting).
- Collapsed time frame to meet 6/1/12 deadline (some appointees had overlapping meeting times).
- Information not readily available (meeting time, agenda, supporting documentation, background information).
- Formal legal counsel not yet available to advise OB and help interpret ABx1 26 (OB often relied on SA attorney).
- Having Repository available has been helpful to process.
- Given tight time frames, team worked well together and very responsive.

FUTURE PROCESS/PROCEDURES DISCUSSION

2. Asset Disposition

Property Assets

## **June 7, 2012 Redevelopment Dissolution Meeting**

- In many cases, disposition process has started, OB appointees are requesting assistance from County (consultants are advising delay, however more guidance is being sought)
- Need clarification regarding how assets should be categorized under ABx 126 (governmental v. non-governmental use, assets constructed and used, housing assets with non-housing/market rate components and/or funding, etc.)
- Some OBs have been asked to consider Property Disposition Procedures.
- Need understanding of SCO involvement in process.
- In some instances, assets are part of an agreement that is an enforceable obligation (ex. DDA).
- Issues related to ownership of asset (many former RDA assets are held by City).
- Issues related to revenue producing uses such as parking.
- County may have strategic interest in some of these assets.

### **Other Assets: Determination of Cash Balances**

- Determine what is encumbered/unencumbered.
- Have any balances been borrowed against or transferred to City or other entities?
- Determine whether former RDA had any obligations from 7/1/11-1/31/12 that were not included on EOPS but were paid.

### **Other Assets: Revenue Produced from Assets**

- Consider revenue stream in valuation of asset that city chooses to retain (ex. should revenue stream be valued in order to calculate an upfront payment to affected taxing entities, or can revenue stream be shared over time?)

## **3. ROPS III (January 2013-June 2013)**

### **Schedule**

- Prepare schedule to allow for robust review process and a reasonable time period for AC to calculate and make payments.
- Notify OB of recommended timing (some OBs are not scheduled to meet until October).

### **Obtain Feedback from County OB Appointees**

- What worked well and what can be improved?

### **Determine "Final" ROPS I and II**

- Obtain ROPS sent to DOF.
- List items disapproved by DOF.

## **June 7, 2012 Redevelopment Dissolution Meeting**

- List questionable items with S0 that might appear on future ROPS (DOF said okay to list).
- List other items of question.
- County consider request for final DOF-approved ROPS schedules to be prepared and submitted to OB. (ex. CRA LA prepared a revised ROPS based on DOF feedback).

### **Share AUP Information**

- Determine common themes.
- Recommend follow up actions for OB.

### **Further Review Supporting Documentation**

- Obtain documentation not yet made available.

### **Coordinate with County Counsel Review of Key Issues**

- Create list of key issues (ex. unpaid PTs from prior years; Deferred PTs; Pasadena SB 481, Industry set-aside, and other special legislation; Issue of override revenue pledged per bond covenants; etc.).
- Consider implications of potential litigation from public and private claimants.
- Consider implications of budget trailer bill for ABx1 26 cleanup.

## **3. Staff Support**

### **Training**

- Asset disposition/management
- ROPS III schedule and recommended process (DOF Template, etc)
- OB role in housing oversight
- Contracts: renegotiation/re-validation/termination
- Grant matching requirements (ex. 5% or more of funding from RPTTF, OB needs to approve)
- Bond defeasance/refunding
- Cash flow oversight